

Governor's Upper Yellowstone River Task Force
Meeting Summary
September 27, 2001
Yellowstone Inn
Meeting began at 7:00 p.m.

I. Introduction

Members Present:

John Bailey, Chair	Jerry O'Hair
Roy Aserlind	Brant Oswald
Andy Dana	Rod Siring
Doug Ensign	Bob Wiltshire
Michelle Goodwine	Ellen Woodbury
Dave Haug	Jim Woodhull

Others Present:

Laurence Siroky, DNRC Ex-Officio	Travis Swaim	Scott Bosse
Allan Steinle, Corps Ex-Officio	Chuck Dalby	Chris Mehus
Stan Sternberg, MDT Ex-Officio	Karl Biastoch	Jim Robinson
Liz Galli-Noble, Coordinator	Jeanne-Marie Souvigney	Ryan Ullman
Amy Miller, Administrative Secretary	Daryl Stutterheim	Mike Penfold
Duncan Patten	Dona Penfold	Tom Pick
Peter Ismert	Doug Harrison	Lionel Dicharry
Paul Azevedo	Wendy Dahle	

II. Prior Meeting Minutes

The June 26, 2001 minutes were approved as written.

III. Task Force Reappointment

Governor's Executive Order for Task Force Reappointment

John Bailey reported that Governor Judy Martz signed *Executive Order No. 21-01* on August 21, 2001, which reappointed the Task Force to a third term, ending August 20, 2003. John Bailey asked Liz Galli-Noble to mail copies of the executive order to all Task Force members.

New Task Force Members

John Bailey introduced the new Task Force members: Andy Dana (replacing Mike Atwood) and Doug Ensign (replacing Tom Lane). Current Task Force members welcomed the new members.

Selection of Task Force Officers (Chair, Vice Chair)

Given that the Task Force had been reappointed to a new term, John Bailey called for officer nominations, beginning with the Chair position. Michelle Goodwine nominated John Bailey for Chair, and no other nominations were made.

Rod Siring moved to "approve John Bailey as the chair of the Task Force". David Haug seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

John Bailey then called for nominations for Task Force Vice Chair. Jerry O'Hair nominated Bob Wiltshire. Dave Haug nominated Jerry O'Hair. Michelle Goodwine nominated Dave Haug. Both Bob Wiltshire and Jerry O'Hair asked to be removed from consideration because they both felt that they were too busy to function as the vice chair. Minimal discussion followed and no further nominations were made.

Andy Dana moved to “approve Dave Haug as the vice chair of the Task Force”. Michelle Goodwine seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Financial Updates

1. Grant Spending Report:

Amy Miller reported the following to the Task Force:

<i>EXPENDED GRANTS</i>			
Grant Name	Completed	Amount	Study Component
DNRC Watershed Planning Assistance Grant	6-30-99	2,100.00	Physical Features Inventory
DNRC HB223 Grant	7-30-99	10,000.00	Aerial Photography
DNRC Riparian/Wetlands Educational Grant	6-30-00	960.99	Hydrologic Response to the 1988 Fires
DEQ Grant (319 1 st)	9-30-00	40,000.00	Coordinator Position
DNRC Watershed Planning Assistance Grant	1-31-01	10,000.00	Watershed Land Use Study
DEQ Start-Up Grant	6-26-01	49,138.00	Coordinator Position, Administrative Secretary, additional cross-sections, And operating expenses.
<i>CURRENT GRANTS</i>			
Grant Name	Amount	Spent	Remaining Balance
DNRC RDGP Grant	299,940.00	214,628.05	85,311.95
DEQ 319 Grant (2 nd)	58,000.00	25,259.42	32,740.58
DEQ 319 Grant (3 rd)	44,000.00	0	44,000.00
DNRC HB223 (Riparian Trend Analysis Study)	6,500.00	5,265.61	1,234.39
BLM Funding (Wildlife Study)	10,000	9,202.80	797.20

As requested by the Task Force, Liz Galli-Noble reported the Corps budget summary (no changes from the May 2001 report). New spending for the Socio-Economic Assessment and the topographic mapping project will be reported shortly.

US Army Corps of Engineers

Budget Summary (as of May 2001)

Item	Vendor	Amount Spent	Task/Study Funded
Labor & Travel & Contracts	Corps	69,079	Project Coordination
Color Infrared Photos	Private	9,620	NWI Wetland Mapping
Demo Maps	USFWS	3,316	NWI Wetland Mapping
Corridor Inventory	USFWS	17,511	NWI Wetland Mapping
Digital Orthophotos	US Forest Service	32,000	Topographic Mapping Project
Full Study	MSU—USGS Coop	97,536	Fish Populations Study
Fieldwork	USDA—NRCS	25,700	Physical Features Inventory
Fieldwork	USGS—WRD	6,500	Hydraulic Analysis
Fieldwork	USDA—NRCS	5,000	HGM
Fieldwork	USGS—BRD	200,000	Fish Habitat Study
Fieldwork	MSU—USGS Coop	106,000	Wildlife Study (Bird Study)
Floodplain Maps	Corps	150,000**	Topographic Mapping
Fieldwork/Analysis	Private	100,000+**	Socio-Economic Analysis
		\$562,642 + 250,000** = 822,262**	

** = Estimated cost

Budget Explanation:

FY 1999 Congressional Appropriation	\$320,000
FY 1999 Corps Regulatory Branch	\$52,000
FY 2001 Congressional Appropriation	<u>\$650,000</u>

	Total	\$1,022,000
May 2001		
Total obligations to date	\$572,262 + \$250,000** = \$822,262**	
Balance remaining from FY 99	\$0	
Balance remaining from FY 01	\$199,738**	
Total project funds remaining	\$199,738**	

2. EPA End-of-Year Funding

Liz Galli-Noble reported that the Geomorphology Study is still not completely funded. With the approval of John Bailey, Liz requested that the EPA attempt to move “end-of-the-year” Fiscal Year 2001 funding to the Geomorphology Study (in the amount of \$30,000). The EPA was unable to do so before September 30, 2001—the end of FY 2001. However, Peter Ismert (Yellowstone River contact, EPA Denver) reported that they may be able to assist the Task Force effort with “carry-over” FY 2002 funding, and that a request had already been submitted to the EPA Washington DC office for review.

3. FY 2002 Congressional Appropriations

Liz reported that she and John Bailey had submitted a FY 2002 congressional appropriations general funding request (\$250,000) to Montana’s Congressional Delegation staff in late August 2001. The funding proposal (*Attachment A*) had been requested by Senator Burns’, Senator Baucus’, and Congressman Rehberg’s offices, and a copy was provided to the Task Force for their review. John Bailey explained that initially, when the overall Cumulative Effects Assessment budget was proposed, the Task Force did not know how much funding would be needed for the final project phase. After all of our research data has been collected, the public will need to be given access to that data, as well as being educated about what the data is telling us. The Task Force will require funding for this data dissemination/educational phase of the project, and would appreciate congressional backing, or their assistance in other ways, to secure this critical funding.

V. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Business

Wildlife Literature Review

Duncan Patten, TAC Chair, reported that the TAC met on August 10, 2001 and one of the agenda items discussed was the wildlife literature review conducted by the USGS—BRD. He then presented the TAC’s decision (see *Attachment B* for details). A lengthy discussion followed, surrounding a focal question: If the Task Force is not formally endorsing this document, why are we involved in its revision? Some of the comments made were:

- The TAC is willing to modify the document.
- The Task Force did not fund this document.
- The Task Force does not need to endorse this document.
- We need to disconnect the Task Force from this document. (Jerry O’Hair)
- If modified, the document would become cleaner and friendlier.
- The USFWS has pulled the document from publication.
- The USFWS is willing to modify the literature review. They hope to salvage this publication.
- Is this document valuable to the US Army Corps of Engineers? (Andy Dana) No. (Allan Steinle)
- Researchers would be able to use this publication—it would be like using a book or other reference materials.
- I am confused; will this document become a law or rule? I have seen documents that were supposed to be “drafts” be used as final publications. (Jerry O’Hair)
- Can this document be revised by the end of the year? (Brant Oswald) Yes. (Duncan Patten)
- Why complete changes 1 through 6, if the Task Force is not happy with the product and nobody cares? (Andy Dana)

Response: This is necessary to remove the connection with the Task Force and to correct discrepancies. The statement on the TAC species recommendation will be removed from the document. (Duncan Patten)

- Duncan Patten reiterated that this is a working document; it provides useful information for those developing working models and concepts to be used in development of management or other resource strategies.
- Jerry O’Hair does not understand why the Task Force needs to be involved in the rewrite.
Response: It is important to keep the TAC involved, that way the Task Force remains in control of this literature review process. (Duncan Patten)
- What does the rejection of this document mean? (Doug Ensign)
- Does the Task Force have to accept the TAC’s recommendations or suggestions? (Roy Aserlind)
- What can be done with this document in order for the Task Force to endorse it? (Doug Ensign)

Bob Wiltshire moved to “make the following change to the TAC recommendations to the Task Force: substitute the word ‘acknowledge’ the working document, instead of ‘accept’ the working document”. Dave Haug seconded the motion. There was not consensus on the motion because Jerry O’Hair voted against the motion.

After additional discussion, a second motion was made:

Andy Dana moved to “delete recommendation number 1 all together, and to have the TAC complete numbers 2 and 3.” Bob Wiltshire seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Task Force decided that there was still some confusion concerning the wildlife literature review and that the issue should be put on the October Task Force meeting agenda for further discussion. In the mean time, Duncan was asked to again discuss the publication and TAC recommendations with the full TAC at their October 16 meeting. The TAC should address the deletion of recommendation #1 and add a timeline within which time changes would be completed.

TAC Publication Protocol

After receiving input from the TAC members and John Bailey, Duncan Patten and Liz Galli-Noble developed a proposed TAC protocol; it was a direct response to many of the unresolved issues surrounding the wildlife literature review. Duncan reviewed the proposed protocol with the Task Force (see *Attachment C*). The following comments were made:

- I. RESEARCH TEAM PRESENTATIONS TO TASK FORCE – Task Force plays a key role in this stage, providing feedback and asking questions that the preliminary findings should address.
- III. PROTOCOLS FOR PUBLICATIONS – Task Force and TAC do not play a role in this stage, the scientific community is involved.
- II. PROTOCOL FOR FINAL REPORTS – this is a peer review stage; the contractor has control over deliverables; TAC reviews interpretation of findings.
- II. PROTOCOL FOR FINAL REPORTS – at this stage it is too late for the Task Force to give comment; comment must come in Stage I.
- Can the contractor (Corps and/or Park Conservation District) hold back payment if the Task Force does not agree with product? (Andy Dana)

Response: The Corps would withhold payment if the deliverable was unacceptable as specified in the contract. The District would take their lead from the Task Force and would base their decision on the deliverable specified in the contract. Contract deliverables are based on Task Force-approved research proposals.

- I. RESEARCH TEAM PRESENTATIONS TO TASK FORCE – in this stage, dialogue is encouraged when preliminary findings are presented to the Task Force.

As was the case with the wildlife literature review discussion, the Task Force decided that there was still some confusion concerning the TAC protocol and that the issue should be put on the October Task Force meeting agenda for further discussion. Duncan was asked to take the protocol back to the TAC for their input and full approval.

Cumulative Impact Analysis Workshop

Duncan Patten reported on a spring 2002 Cumulative Impact Analysis Workshop that he is planning. The workshop would be sponsored by MSU and involve a group of scientists discussing cumulative impact analysis of large river systems. Possible funding sources for the workshop include: MSU, the EPA, DNRC, and Corps. The workshop will probably be held in Billings. The workshop is not open to the public.

VI. Yellowstone River Conservation District Council (YRCDC)

Liz Galli-Noble introduced Chris Mehus (Sweet Grass County Conservation District and YRCDC Vice Chair), Daryl Stutterheim (Park Conservation District and YRCDC member), and Travis Swaim (new YRCDC Coordinator). These individuals were invited to speak before the Task Force in order to provide information on the YRCDC and to address the YRCDC Regional Advisory Committee.

Daryl Stutterheim gave a brief history of the YRCDC. The YRCDC began approximately three years ago, when conservation districts along the Yellowstone River came together to lead a new effort to conduct a study of the full Yellowstone River. The YRCDC is made up of the ten conservation districts located along the river and one representative from the Montana Association of Conservation Districts. Given that the Task Force is doing a cumulative effect investigation on the upper river, much of their focus is from Springdale to confluence with the Missouri.

Chris Mehus briefed the group on the YRCDC Resource Advisory Committee (RAC). The RAC is made up of 18 voting members from the following groups: fishing recreationists, agriculture, conservation community, elected officials, and industries. They function as an advisory group to the YRCDC, and they have only been meeting for the past few months.

Chris Mehus and Daryl Stutterheim (on behalf of the YRCDC) asked the Task Force to allow Liz Galli-Noble to attend YRCDC and RAC meetings in Billings in order to share information on the upper Yellowstone River effort and foster better communication between the groups. In addition, Chris and Daryl invited the Task Force to sit on the RAC as a non-voting, ex-officio member to offer technical guidance. Note: The Task Force had already received a written invitation from Dave Schwarz (YRCDC Chair) to join the RAC in early 2001.

Currently, RAC meetings are held once a month. Chris feels that the Task Force would provide the voice of experience, which would be helpful to the group. Jeanne-Marie Souvigny, RAC member, encouraged the Task Force to become involved in the RAC and to attend the meetings.

The Task Force did not take action on this request. More time would be needed in order to make a decision concerning their involvement with the YRCDC and its RAC. John Bailey mentioned that policy questions would be answered by him, the Chair, and that Liz Galli-Noble could answer technical questions. Task Force members also voiced their concerns about Liz's travel budget; whether or not there would be enough funding to cover Liz's expenses when attending these meetings. Liz explained that over the past two years she has spent little of her travel budget, and that at present there is enough funding available to absorb a few more meetings. Amy confirmed that budget statement. In addition, Liz explained that her schedule has eased in the last six months and she does have time to attend the meetings, for the time being. The Task Force members agreed to allow Liz to attend the next few YRCDC and RAC meetings.

VII. Watershed Land Use Assessment Update

Tom Pick and Doug Harrison, NRCS Bozeman Office, presented a progress report on the Watershed Land Use

Assessment (see *Attachment D* for presentation summary). They concluded their update by explaining that technical questions still need to be addressed concerning the watershed land use change model. The Task Force decided that the TAC needs to review this product and then report back to the Task Force. The Task Force then directed Tom and Doug to brief the TAC at the October 16 TAC meeting.

VIII. Socio-Economic Assessment Update

Dave Haug, Socio-Economic subcommittee chair, reported on the progress of the Socio-Economic Assessment. For budgetary reasons, the Phase I assessment contract will be finalized by September 30, 2001, or earlier. This deadline is driven by the need to finalize the contract before the end of FY 2001. A detailed summary of this issue is found in *Attachment E*.

IX. Outreach and Education Activities Updates

Liz reported that she has accomplished the following outreach activities since July 2001:

River Tour with DEQ/Socio-Economic Subcommittee, August 15
Presentation to Conservation Roundtable, September 4, Billings
YRCDC RAC meeting, September 5, Billings
Montana Watershed Coordinator's Retreat, September 16 – 18, Blackfoot River Watershed
YRCDC meeting, September 20, 2001, Billings
Presentation to MSU Landscape Architecture Class, September 26, Bozeman

X. Coordinator Evaluation

Although not on the agenda, John Bailey mentioned that it was time to do the coordinator's annual evaluation. The Evaluation Subcommittee members are: John Bailey, Ellen Woodbury, Dave Haug, and Teri Marceron. The subcommittee will meet to complete the evaluation and will report back to the Task Force.

XI. Schedule Next Task Force Meeting

Liz Galli-Noble requests that Task Force members call her at #222-3701, if they will be unable to attend scheduled meetings.

The next Task Force meetings are scheduled for:

Tuesday October 16, 2001 at the Yellowstone Inn.
Tuesday November 13, 2001 at the Yellowstone Inn.
Thursday December 13, 2001 at the Yellowstone Inn.

XII. The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Appendix A.

Governor's Upper Yellowstone River Task Force Cumulative Effects Investigation August 17, 2001

The following are Task Force-approved components of the Upper Yellowstone River Cumulative Effects Investigation that do not have an identified funding source, as of August 17, 2001. Budget amounts are estimated.

Funding Priority	Budget	Investigation Component
1	\$100,000	<u>Public Outreach and Education</u> Public meetings and tours Final CEA Workshop
2	\$50,000	Data Dissemination and Report Publication
3	\$50,000	Task Force Staff and Administrative Support Task Force Coordinator Task Force Office
4	\$50,000	Possible Research Shortfalls 1. Socio-Economic Assessment 2. Watershed Land Use Assessment Change Model

Appendix B. Technical Advisory Committee's Recommendation Concerning the Wildlife Literature Review September 21, 2001

The Task Force made a formal motion at the June 26th meeting to “have the TAC review the Wildlife Literature Review and give their recommendation to the Task Force at our next meeting.”

The TAC met on August 10, 2001 to address this issue and others; see attached TAC meeting minutes for discussion details.

Wildlife Literature Review Background

Approximately three years ago, the US Fish and Wildlife Service offered to fund a literature review at \$10,000 as a preliminary step toward the wildlife investigation; much like what was done for the fisheries population study.

Like many actions taken very early-on in the overall study process, a proposal to do a literature review was never formally taken before the Task Force but was presented to the TAC, who approved it in concept. It also was (1) informally discussed by TAC members, (2) mentioned in Task Force annual reports, and (3) informally reported-on to the Task Force.

Originally, select members of the TAC envisioned that the publication would produce a literature review and a conservation strategy matrix (focusing on species impacted by change in riparian habitat). This vision was never pursued however, because there was never enough money to produce them; \$10,000 was not enough to pay for both of those products. The decision for a final product then became what we now have: a literature review and scaled-down matrix. The USGS—BRD authored the publication. There were minor draft publication reviews done by Rob Hazlewood and Dr. Mike Merigliano.

The TAC recommendation to the Task Force is as follows:

- (1) The TAC is asking the Task Force to accept this publication as a “working document.” What is meant by “working document” is a publication that contains useful information for those developing working models and concepts to be used in development of management or other resource strategies.
- (2) The TAC is not seeking official Task Force endorsement for the product.
- (3) All mention of the Task Force and TAC will be removed from the publication. This will simply be a USFWS Open File Report, which will likely be used by the Corps.

It was determined that the following changes needed to be made to the Wildlife Literature Review to make it acceptable to the TAC:

1. The document needs a clear statement of objectives and purpose in a preamble.
2. Dennis Buechler and Rob Hazlewood will write a preamble.
3. This document will require technical editing; this should be done through a peer review process.
4. *Table 1* will be deleted. Mention of Task Force and TAC will be deleted.
5. Liz Galli-Noble will provide wordsmithing edits for the introductory sections, which reflect comments made by Task Force members.

Duncan Patten will over see the process and edit where he is knowledgeable.

Appendix C. PROPOSED TAC PROTOCOL

September 14, 2001

Based on input from TAC members at our August 10th meeting and a conversation with John Bailey, Duncan Patten is proposing the following TAC protocols.

Note: Let's always try and remember that the primary reason for establishing this process is to ensure that our research products are as good as possible.

I. RESEARCH TEAM PRESENTATIONS TO THE TASK FORCE

Research teams will present to the Task Force in a three step process (this process will occur before or simultaneously to II and III below):

1. Preliminary Findings: preliminary findings from individual studies will be presented as they become available.
2. Interpretation and Integration: preliminary findings will be interpreted and findings from other pertinent studies will be integrated by the research team, and presented to the Task Force.
3. Conclusions: preliminary data, interpretation of that data, and integration with other studies will be summarized by the research team, and conclusions will be presented to the Task Force.

II. PROTOCOL FOR FINAL REPORTS

1. Preliminary Peer Review (draft report): research team leader solicits internal peer review amongst discipline experts; this review process should be documented in draft final and final report.
2. Contractor Review of Deliverable (draft final report): Task Force, Corps, and Park Conservation District study contracts specify deliverable and data release boundaries/guidelines.
3. TAC Peer Review (final final report): TAC reviews interpretation of findings for scientific validity and acceptance **for the Task Force**.

III. PROTOCOL FOR PUBLICATIONS

1. Peer Review Journals

"Normal" protocol for publications should be used. Authors would use an internal or preliminary peer review before going to publication. Review will normally include external peer review for scientific publications.

Accepted manuscripts and copies of final publications should be made available to the TAC.

2. Grey Literature (e.g., Governmental Publications and Reports)

Generally, many governmental publications have extensive internal peer reviews and therefore are treated much like peer-reviewed literature publications.

1. Preliminary Peer Review (draft report): research team leader solicits internal peer review amongst discipline experts.
2. Agency undergoes external peer review (when appropriate) prior to publication and release.
3. Furnish a courtesy copy of publication to Task Force, Corps, and District.

Appendix D.
UPPER YELLOWSTONE RIVER WATERSHED
LAND COVER/USE ASSESSMENT PROJECT

Land Cover Mapping
and
Land Cover Change
by
USDA - NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE and
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-GIAC

OBJECTIVES

1. Depict Area And Amount Of Present Land Uses
2. Depict Area And Amount Of Past Land Uses
3. Determine Change Over Time
4. Interpret And Provide Recommendations As Appropriate
5. Incorporate Into C.E.S.

PROGRESS

1. Classification (MSU)
2. Field Ground Truth (NRCS)
3. Revise Plan
4. Final Classification (MSU)
5. Change Model Limitations
6. 1999 Cover - Filter And Stratify (NRCS)
7. 1999 Cover Report (Draft - NRCS)

REMAINING

Land Cover Mapping

- **LANDSAT imagery**
 - **LANDSAT 7. Launched 1999**
- **Measures light at several important wavelengths**
 - **Blue: soil and plant types, forest types, buildings, roads, water**
 - **Green: Borders between vegetation types**
 - **Red: Chlorophyll absorption by plants**
 - **Near-Infrared: plant biomass amount, vegetation types, water, soil moisture**
 - **Mid-Infrared: moisture in vegetation and soils**

Example

- **Brisbin**
Topographic Map and Elevation
Landsat 7 ETM+

Field Data

- **Field visits to identify land cover types**
- **Use field data to**
 - **classify the LANDSAT imagery**
 - **check the classification**

Field Data

Classify Landsat: Land Cover

Land Cover 1999

Land Cover Change Mapping

- Use Imagery from different dates
 - LANDSAT 7, Launched 1999, is one of a series of LANDSAT Satellites:
 - LANDSAT 5. Launched 1984
 - LANDSAT 4. Launched 1982
 - LANDSAT 3. Launched 1978
 - LANDSAT 2. Launched 1975
 - LANDSAT 1. Launched 1972

CHANGE OVER TIME

Classify image

Change Detection Method

- Work backwards from recent to past
- Identify areas of change and no change from the imagery
- Classify old image using known (recent) land covers in areas of no change
- Recode areas of change in land cover

Recode areas of change

Land Cover 1985

Land cover maps

LIMITATIONS

1. Cloud Cover
2. Artifacts
3. Sensor Differences

**Appendix E. Socio-Economic Subcommittee Meeting
September 24, 2001
Meeting Minutes**

Subcommittee members present:

Roy Aserlind, Dave Haug, Jim Woodhull, and Liz Galli-Noble.

The Socio-Economic Subcommittee met over lunch (from noon to 1:00 pm) to discuss the final phase of contract negotiations for the Socio-Economic Assessment. Dave Haug, who was appointed by the subcommittee to represent them during contract negotiations between the Corps and BBC, briefed the subcommittee on the following actions:

The Corps began a new RFQ process on August 7, 2001. Proposals were accepted for three weeks. At the end of that process, the Corps selected BBC as the preferred contractor. Dave was then asked to participate in two conference calls with the Corps and BBC on September 16 and 24, 2001. Those meetings focused on final contract negotiations. As of today (September 24), the decision was made by all parties to go ahead and sign a contract. For budgetary reasons, the contract will be finalized by September 30, 2001, or earlier. This deadline is driven by the need to finalize the contract before the end of fiscal year 2001.

Nothing in the new BBC proposal varies from the original Task Force study requirements. The only new items are:

(1) BBC's Final Proposal

Task 5b: Description of Land Use Trends

This section was added at the request of the Corps with the approval of the Socio-Econ subcommittee. The USFWS will be accomplishing this task, not BBC.

Task 6. Historic and Current Management Actions, Including Bank Stabilization Projects, and Irrigation Uses

This section will not be deleted at the request of the Task Force.

Task 7b. Social Assessment: Existing 404 Permit Process, Future No-Action Condition

This section was added at the request of the Corps with the approval of the Socio-Econ subcommittee.

(2) Contract Timeframe

The contract should be signed by October 1, 2001. The length of the contract should be October 1, 2001 to October 1, 2002.

(3) Public Meeting Dates

BBC is required to do two public meetings, and to officially meet with the Task Force two times. It was proposed that the public meetings would take place in January 2002 and late summer 2002. It was strongly suggested that the Task Force meetings should coincide with these dates.

The Socio-Economic subcommittee was comfortable with the progress taken by Dave Haug, the Corps, and BBC. A final version of the contract will be given to the subcommittee in the near future, and BBC plans to start work in October 2001.